



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/686,719

10/17/2003

Jong-Phil Lee

44663

8798

7590

01/14/2009

Peter L. Kendall
Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
Suite 600
1300 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

LAI, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2457

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/14/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/686,719	Applicant(s) LEE, JONG-PHIL	
	Examiner MICHAEL C. LAI	Art Unit 2457	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communication filed on 10/7/2008.

Claims 1-14 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. The examiner has acknowledged the amended claims 1, 3, 7, and 9. The 112 second paragraph rejection to claims 1 and 9 has been corrected and withdrawn accordingly. Claims 1-14 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o).
Correction of the following is required: Applicant fails to provide antecedent basis for the claim terminology "computer-readable medium" in claims 9-14.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 12, "diving" should be "driving."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2457

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the telecommunication system" in lines 9-10. It is not clear which telecommunication system the limitation is referring to. Note that both line 5 and amended line 6 recites the limitation "a telecommunication system."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer (US 6,519,241B1, hereinafter Theimer), in view of Hauduc et al. (US 6,993,568 B1, hereinafter Hauduc), and further in view of Shi et al (US 7,032,003 B1, hereinafter Shi).

Regarding claim 1, Theimer discloses a device for managing information data in a mobile IP-based mobile telephone, the device comprising:

an embedded web server for displaying a homepage of the mobile telephone on a web browser when linked to the mobile telephone through the web browser of a telecommunication system [FIG. 1 and column 3, lines 26-48] and driving a CGI/ASP program to generate a command for communication

between the mobile phone and a telecommunication system using the web browser [As one skilled in the art knows when a user submits a form through a Web browser, the HTTP server executes a program (often called a CGI script or CGI program) and passes the user's input information to that program via CGI. The program then returns information to the server via CGI (see Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 5th Edition). Theimer discloses communications between the Web server and the Web browser/other servers via a CGI (see column 4, lines 16-26). Theimer clearly teaches this limitation];

a CGI/ASP program of server driven by the embedded web server to generate a command for communication between the mobile telephone and the telecommunication system using the web browser [col. 4, lines 16-26];

a homepage of the mobile telephone for displaying information management menus of the mobile telephone [col. 1, lines 34-44]; and

a memory for storing data of the information management menus [col. 4, lines 8-13, storage medium 12].

Theimer discloses substantially all the limitations, but fails to specifically disclose a language pack storing at least one language so that the information management menus can be displayed in a selected language. However, Hauduc discloses the idea of using language packs that can convert the content of the Web pages into the desired language and render the translated content for the Web client [col. 2, lines 35-49]. Thus it would have been obvious to a person

with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Theimer by incorporating Hauduc's idea for the purpose of providing the content of a Web application in the client's preferred language, thereby providing language localization for server-based applications.

Theimer and Hauduc disclose substantially all the limitations as described above, but fail to specifically disclose about transmitting a message confirming that data updated in the web browser has been updated in the mobile telephone to the web browser. However Shi discloses a method to synchronize local data storage on a mobile phone with a web browser (claims 1-13). Thus it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Theimer and Hauduc by incorporating Shi's idea for the purpose of synchronizing the web browser with data on mobile phones by transmitting a message confirming that data updated in the web browser has been updated in the mobile telephone to the web browser, thereby providing an up-to-date and consistent system.

Regarding claim 2, Theimer further discloses wherein said information management menus represent information of the mobile telephone [col. 1, lines 34-44].

Regarding claim 3, Theimer and Hauduc disclose substantially all the limitations as described above, but fail to specifically disclose about the data synchronization method between the mobile telephone and the web browser.

However Shi discloses a method to synchronize local data storage on a mobile phone with a web browser (claims 1-13). Thus it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Theimer and Hauduc by incorporating Shi's idea for the purpose of synchronizing the web browser with data on mobile phones, thereby providing an up-to-date and consistent system.

Claims 4-5 substantially incorporate all the limitations of claims 1-3. The reasons for the rejection of claims 1-3 apply to claims 4-5. Therefore claims 4-5 are rejected for substantially the same reasons.

Regarding claims 6-7, Theimer further discloses wherein said command includes a standard protocol for communication between the mobile telephone and the telecommunication system using the web browser [col. 4, lines 16-25].

Claim 8 is of the same scope as claim 2. It is rejected for the same reason as for claim 2.

Claims 9-14 are of the same scope as claims 3-8. They are rejected for the same reasons as for claims 3-8.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

12. Parry, US Patent Number 7,002,703 B2, has taught methods of using an embedded Web server on a printing device to automatically download desired web-based data from a remote Web site.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and

Art Unit: 2457

figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Lai whose telephone number is (571) 270-3236. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2457

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael C. Lai
12JAN2009

/YVES DALENCOURT/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2457